

LISA A. RASMUSSEN, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 007491
California Bar No. 207026
LAW OFFICE OF LISA RASMUSSEN, ESQ.
616 South 8th Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Tel. (702) 471-6565
Fax. (702) 471-6540
Lisa@LRasmussenLaw.com
Local Counsel for Jessica Gaona, Objector

EDWARD F. SIEGEL
Law Office of Edward F. Siegel
27600 Chagrin Blvd.
Cleveland, OH 44122
Tel. (216) 831-3424
Fax. (216) 831-6584
efiegel@efs-law.com
Counsel for Deborah Maddox, Objector

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

In Re:
**WAL-MART Wage and Hour
Employment Practices Litigation**

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

MDL - 1735

02:06-cv-225 PMP (PAL)

APPELLANTS JESSICA GAONA
AND DEBORAH MADDOX' JOINT
RESPONSE TO CLASS COUNSEL'S
MOTION FOR BOND FOR APPEAL
(C.R. # 541, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546 and
549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554)

COME NOW Objectors JESSICA GAONA, by and through her counsel, Lisa A. Rasmussen, Esq., and Christopher A. Bandas, Esq.; and DEBORAH MADDOX, by and through her counsel, Edward F. Siegel Esq.; and hereby submit their Joint Response to Class Counsel's Motions for Bond For Appeal and their related document documents. (*See* C.R. #'s 541, 542, 543, 544, 545 and 546 as to Jessica Gaona; and C.R. #'s 549, 550, 551, 552, 553 and 554 as to Deborah Maddox.)

•

Response

RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO WAL-MART'S MOTION

Class Counsel for the Plaintiffs seeks an appeal bond from Objectors Jessica Gaona and Deborah Maddox under Rule 7 FRAP. The Motion is essentially duplicative of the request made by Plaintiff Nancy Hall. The parties herein have already filed their Response to Plaintiff Nancy Hall's Motion, incorporated herein by this reference. (*See* C.R.#556.) Specifically, class counsel requests bond in the amount of approximately \$608,000 from Gaona and bond in the amount of approximately \$610,000 from Maddox. (*See* C.R. #542 at page 1, and #550 at page 1.) This, this response in opposition will simply repeat the arguments in opposition to Class Plaintiffs. As explained in Response to Class Plaintiff Nancy Hall's Motion for Bond, \$715,000 or \$990,000 sought by class counsel are not for costs. Class Plaintiffs' request here is essentially duplicative, though the amounts vary somewhat. Nevertheless, the claimed bond costs items are not bondable on appeal under the facts of this case. Under Rule 7 FRAP, a bond cannot include attorneys' fees or administrative costs. Objectors/Appellants' objections to the settlement and Class Counsel's attorneys' fees, and their appeal from the order overruling their objections to the settlement and class counsel's fees, are facially not frivolous and their appeal is highly unlikely to be declared so by the appellate panel.

It is clear that Class Counsel is seeking bonds in excess of \$600,000 in an attempt to stifle objectors' appeal from this court's approval of the settlement and their attorneys' fees. That is not a proper use of the rules relating to bonding, and the Court should not allow it pursuant to Rule 7 FRAP. Class Plaintiffs' are entitled to a bond for the actual costs explicitly taxable pursuant to in Rule 39 FRAP, but not anything more.

A. Neither the Objections to Attorney Fees Nor the Appeals Are Frivolous

The overarching theme of Class Plaintiffs' request for the bonds in this case is that Objectors/Appellants' objection to the settlement and class counsel's fees are frivolous, and that Objectors/Appellants counsel are "professional objectors"¹ who pursue objections for improper purposes.

¹ Although class counsel may prefer pro se objectors, or objectors counsel with no experience in class actions, due process assures objectors the right to professional representation.

1 First, an appeal is frivolous if "the result is obvious or if the claims of error are wholly without
 2 merit." *DeWitt v. Western Pacific Railroad Co.*, 719 F.2d 1448, 1451 (9th Cir. 1983). The fact that
 3 there is a body of federal jurisprudence regarding attorney's fees shows reasonable people often differ
 4 on this issue. 28 U.S.C. Section 1927, which might support a bond for "vexatious litigation conduct,"
 5 is inapplicable to this appeal as it requires "bad faith or intentional misconduct by counsel." Although
 6 the imposition of attorney's fees on appeal as a sanction is allowed under Rule 38, it is only available
 7 after the appeals court finds the appeal frivolous, and only upon further motion and hearing. 10 Wright,
 8 Miller & Kane, *Federal Practice & Procedure*, §2675; 2675.2 (2001); see also *Azizian v. Federated*
 9 *Department Stores, Inc.*, 499 F.3d 950, 960 (9th Cir. 2007).

10 It is well established that whether an appeal is frivolous is solely within the purview of the
 11 appellate court, not the district court. *Vaughn v. American Honda Motor Co., Inc.*, 507 F.3d 295, 299
 12 (5th Cir. 2007); *Cooter & Gell v. Hartmax Corp.*, 496 U.S. 384, 407 (1990); *In re American President*
 13 *Lines, Inc.*, 779 F.2d 714, 717 (D.C. Cir 1985). Only the appellate court has the authority to impose
 14 sanctions for a frivolous appeal, *Aizian*, 499 F.3d at 960; *In re Vasseli*, 5 F.3d 351, 353 (9th Cir 1993)
 15 citing *In re American President Lines, Inc.* 779 F.2d 714, 717 (D.C. Cir. 1985).

16 In the case of *Azizian v. Federated Department Stores, Inc.*, the 9th Circuit considered the
 17 question of under what circumstances a district court may require an appellant to include appellate
 18 attorney's fees in an appeal bond. See *Azizian*, 499 F.3d 950. The *Azizian* court determined that a
 19 district court may require an appellant to secure appellate attorney's fees in the appeal bond pursuant
 20 to Rule 7 only if an applicable fee shifting statute includes attorney's fees in its definition of recoverable
 21 costs. *Id.* at 953. In *Azizian*, the district court had ordered appellants to post a \$42,000 appeal bond,
 22 representing \$2,000 in appellate costs under Rule 39 and \$40,000 in appellate attorney's fees. *Id.* at 954.
 23 the district court rationalized its inclusion of attorneys fees in the appeal bond by concluding that the
 24 Court of Appeal was likely to find the appeal frivolous. *Id.* Appellants tendered the \$2,000 of the bond
 25 allocated to costs under Rule 39, but not the \$40,000 allocated to attorney's fees. *Id.* The 9th Circuit
 26 eventually found that the appeal should not be dismissed on the merits because appellants had failed
 27 to post the full bond required by the district court. *Id.* at 954. In discussing the district court's
 28 determination that the Court of Appeal would find the appeal frivolous and therefore award attorney's

1 fees as a sanction under Rule 38, the 9th Circuit stated that "even if we were to conclude that [the
2 appellant's] appeal was frivolous, however, we would reverse the district court's inclusion of appellate
3 attorney's fees on that basis." *Id.* at 960. The 9th Circuit held that the district court's inclusion of
4 attorney's fees in the bond on the grounds that the appeal was likely frivolous was improper for three
5 reasons. *Id.* First, because an award of attorney's fees for a frivolous appeal under Rule 38 is very
6 unusual, and it would be difficult for the district court to gauge whether such an award would be likely.
7 *Id.* Second, if the potentially large sums possible under Rule 38 were included in Rule 7 bonds, the
8 effect would be to chill appeals. *Id.* Third, Rule 38 authorizes the award of attorney's fees as a sanction
9 for improper conduct on appeal, and only the court of appeals may order the sanction of appellate
10 attorney's fees. *Id.* The 9th Circuit concluded that "whether, or how, to deter frivolous appeals is best
11 left to the courts of appeals..." *Id.* at 961. Therefore, there is simply no provision for a district court to
12 make an advance determination that an appeal violates Rule 38, much less authority for imposing a
13 bond to include the anticipated damages and sanctions that the circuit court may ultimately determine.

14 **B. Bondable Costs Do Not Include Attorneys' Fees**

15 Apart from their claim that frivolity of the appeal supports a bond for attorneys' fees, Class
16 Plaintiffs suggests that this Court has the authority to include prospective attorneys' fees as items of
17 Rule 7 FRAP costs. In fact, the majority rule among circuit courts, endorsed by the Second, Sixth,
18 Ninth and Eleventh Circuits, is that a district court may include attorneys' fees in a Rule 7 Bond, but
19 **only if** those attorney's fees would be considered recoverable costs under an applicable fee shifting
20 statute. See *Azizian*, 499 F.3d at 958.

21 This Court now has the opportunity to clarify and update its rule regarding Rule 7 bond orders
22 issued by district courts to bring it in line with the majority view: that attorney's fees may only be
23 included in a Rule 7 bond if the underlying "prevailing party" fee shifting provision of a statute includes
24 attorney's fees as recoverable. This Court also has the opportunity to firmly establish appellate court
25 precedence in the determination of whether an appeal is frivolous, in concert with at least three other
26 circuits by holding that the appellate courts are the best forum in which to determine whether an appeal
27 is frivolous, and that district courts have no authority to make peremptory determinations of
28

1 frivolousness, nor to base bond orders on those predictions. *See Azizian*, 499 F.3d at 960 (9th Cir.
2 2007).

3

4 **CONCLUSION**

5 As set forth above, there is no legal or factual support for the imposition of a Rule 7 bond that
6 exceeds the actual costs and it is respectfully requested that this Court issue an Order denying Class
7 Plaintiffs' Motion for Bond for Appeal, or, in the alternative, limiting any bond that this Court will
8 consider to only the reasonable actual/projected costs permitted.

9 Respectfully submitted and dated this 8th day of January, 2010.

10 **LAW OFFICE OF LISA RASMUSSEN,**

11 */s/ Lisa A. Rasmussen*

12

LISA A. RASMUSSEN, ESQ.
13 Nevada Bar No. 7491
14 Local Counsel for Jessica Gaona, Objector

15 **BANDAS LAW FIRM, P.C.,**

16 */s/ Christopher A. Bandas*

17

CHRISTOPHER A. BANDAS, ESQ.
18 500 N. Shoreline Blvd., Suite 1020
19 Corpus Christi, TX 78471
20 Tel. (361) 698-5200
21 Fax. (361) 698-5222
22 Cbandas@bandaslawfirm.com
23 Counsel for Jessica Gaona, Objector

24 **LAW OFFICE OF EDWARD F. SIEGEL**

25 */s/ Edward F. Siegel*

26

EDWARD F. SIEGEL, ESQ.
27 27600 Chagrin Blvd.
28 Cleveland, OH 44122
Telephone: (216) 831-3424
Facsimile: (216) 831-6584
efiegel@efs-law.com
Counsel for Deborah Maddox, Objector

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of Appellants' Jessica Lynn Gaona and Deborah Maddox' Joint Response to Plaintiffs' Motion for Bond has been served via CM/ECF upon the following persons, on this 8th day of January, 2010:

Co-Lead Class Counsel

Robert J. Bonsignore, Esq. rbonsignore@bandblaw.net

Co-Lead Class Counsel

Carolyn Beasley Burton, Esq. cbeasley@beasleylawgroup.biz

& Counsel for Plaintiff Nancy Hall

Wal-Mart Class Counsel

Naomi Beer, Esq. beern@gtlaw.com

Adriana Contartese
adriana999@juno.com

Ann Miller
am@attorneyannmiller.com

Arthur Y. Park
apark@ppyrlaw.com

Barbara A. Petrus
bpetrus@goodsill.com

Barry M. Klayman
bklayman@cozen.com

Bernard J. Bobber
bbobber@foley.com

Bradd N. Siegel
bsiegel@porterwright.com

Bradley D. Bonner
brad@bonnerstinsonpc.net

Brendan V. Johnson
brendan@ihmmi.com

Brian Duffy
duffyb@gtlaw.com

Brian C. Buescher
Brian.Buescher@kutakrock.com

Brian W Boschee
bboschee@nevadafirm.com

Carol P LaPlant
carollaplant@msn.com

Carolyn K. Gugelyk
cgugelyk@goodsill.com

Christopher P. Welsh
cwelsch@welsh-law.com

Christopher R. Hedican
chedican@bairdholm.com

Craig O. Asbill
casbill@carolinalaw.com

Craig W. Hillwig
chillwig@kohnswift.com

1 Cynthia K. Smith
 2 cks@montanalaw.com

3 Daniel A. Kaplan
 4 dkaplan@foley.com

5 Daniel D Ambrose
 6 daniel@ambroselawyers.com

7 Daniel E. Rausher
 8 danrausher@yahoo.com

9 Daniel J. Mitchell
 10 dmitchell@bernsteinshur.com

11 David L. Young
 12 youngd@lanepowell.com

13 Deena Jo Schneider
 14 dschneider@schnader.com

15 Dirk A Ravenholt
 16 lawdirk@aol.com

17 Don V. Huynh
 18 dhuynh@ppyrlaw.com

19 Donald S Goldbloom
 20 goldbloomlaw@verizon.net

21 Edmund K. Saffery
 22 esaffery@goodsill.com

23 Edward F Siegel
 24 efsiegel@efs-law.com

25 Ellen E. Boshkoff
 26 ellen.boshkoff@bakerd.com

27 Ellen T. Noteware
 28 enoteware@bm.net

29 Eric J Pelton
 30 epelton@kohp.com

31 F. Thomas Edwards
 32 tedwards@nevadafirm.com

33 Franklin D Azar
 34 kingm@fdazar.com

35 Fred Schultz
 36 fschultz@kiva.net

37 Gary R. Scott
 38 gscott@hirstapplegate.com

39 Gary S. Nitsche
 40 gnitsche@attys4u.com

41 George Cournty French
 42 cfrench@fpflaw.com

43 Gerald L. Bader, Jr.
 44 gbader@bader-associates.com

45 Glen W. Neeley
 46 glneeley@yahoo.com

47 Gregory F. Greiner
 48 greg_greiner@msn.com

49 Ivy L Frignoca
 50 ifrignoca@lambertcoffin.com

51 J. Thomas Henretta
 52 jth@henrettalaw.com

53 James E Whitmire, III
 54 jwhitmire@nevadafirm.com

55 James F Bennett
 56 jbennett@dowdbennett.com

57 James M Mullis , Jr
 58 dholloway@mullislawfirm.com

59 James R. Welsh
 60 jwelsh@welsh-law.com

61 Jay A. Urban
 62 jurban@wisconsininjury.com

63 Jeffrey S. Beck
 64 jeffrey.beck@bakerd.com

65 Jeremy Cave
 66 cavej@fdazar.com

67 Jill P. Telfer
 68 jilltelfer@yahoo.com

69 Jim Odell Stuckey , II
 70 jstuckey@littler.com

71 John Pentz
 72 Clasaxn@earthlink.net

1 John C. McLaren
2 john@ppyrlaw.com

John J Rausch
rauschlawfirm@dybb.com

Joseph C. Kohn
jkohn@kohnswift.com

3 Kathleen W. Toth
4 ktoth@mc2b.com

Kent Hirsch
kent@hirschlawfirm.com

Kurt D. Williams
kwilliams@bowse-law.com

6 Lanny H. Darr , II
7 ldarr@sbkdlaw.com

Laurence William Stinson
laurence@bonnerstinsonpc.net

Laurent J. Remillard , Jr
lremillard@ppyrlaw.com

8 Lawrence J Sorohan , II
9 lsorohan@laborlawyers.com

Lee Bruner
lee@prrlaw.com

Lindsay Ann Eckes
leckes@hirstapplegate.com

10 Marcia A. Washkuhn
11 Marcia.Washkuhn@kutarock.com

Maria B Glorioso
maria@gtorts.com

Mark A Tate
mtate@cartertatetlaw.com

13 Mark C. Choate
14 markcchoate@yahoo.com

Mary K. Schug
schugm@lanepowell.com

Matthew T. Tobin
matt@sctrustco.com

15 Melissa Carol Hinton
16 mhinton@dehs.com

Michael Reiss
mikereiss@dwt.com

Michael J. Killeen
mikekilleen@dwt.com

18 Mike J. Miller
19 mjm@solberglaw.com

Nathan R. Long
nate@echohawk.com

Pamela R. Mullis
prmullis@mullislawfirm.com

20 Paul Blankenstein
21 pblankenstein@gibsondunn.com

Paul Alexis Del Aguila
delaguilap@gtlaw.com

Paul C. EchoHawk
paul@echohawk.com

23 R. Deryl Edwards , Jr
24 rde417@hotmail.com

Richard P Batesky , Jr
rpbatesky@aol.com

Robert Carl Jarosh
rjarosh@hirstapplegate.com

25 Robert K. McCalla
26 rmccalla@laborlawyers.com

Robert W Mills
rwm@millslawfirm.com

Roberto Antonio Lange
r lange@dehs.com

1 Rodney P. Bridgers
Bridgersr@fdazar.com

2 Ronald Kilgard
rkilgard@kellerrohrback.com

3 Rudy A. Englund
englundr@lanepowell.com

4 Sammi V. Anderson
sanderson@mc2b.com

5 Samuel K. Rudman
srudman@lambertcoffin.com

6 Stacey E. Tjon
set@solberglaw.com

7 Stephen M Smith
ssmith@braininjurylawcenter.com

8 Susan Brunick Simons
ssimons@dehs.com

9 Thomas A Nicholas , III
tnicholas@hirstapplegate.com

10 Thomas Henry Johnson
thjatty@windstream.net

11 Thomas J. Kenny
thomas.kenny@kutakrock.com

12 Todd S. Collins
tcollins@bm.net

13 Tonya L Melnichenko
melnichenkot@fdazar.com

14 Troy N Giatras
troy@thewvlawfirm.com

15 Vincent J Glorioso , III
trey@gtorts.com

16 Vincent J Glorioso , Jr
lawclerk@gtorts.com

17 Wayne D. Parsons
mdodge@alohano.com

18 William J. Kilberg
wkilberg@gibsondunn.com

19 */s/ Lisa A. Rasmussen*

20 _____

21 Lisa A. Rasmussen, Esq.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28